DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 956 PS 009 209

AUTHOR Minuchin, Patricia
TITLE Exploratory and Cautious Children in Open Classrooms: Autonomy, Learning and Relationships.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 77
GRANT NE-G-00-3-0018
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (New Orleans, Louisiana, March 17-20, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; Classroom Observation Techniques; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Grade 1; *Individual Differences; *Open Education; Peer Relationship; Research; *Response Mode; Self Directed Classrooms; Self Expression; Sex Differences; *Social Relations

ABSTRACT

This study explored the functioning of exploratory and cautious children in open classrooms. Four areas of functioning were focused on: curiosity and exploration, learning and mastery, autonomous behavior, and interpersonal contacts. Thirty exploratory and 30 cautious children were selected through teacher ratings and exploratory tasks and observed in their classrooms throughout a school year. Observational data were collected through detailed narrative records of 5- to 15-minute periods and with a precoded observation system in which behavior was coded in predetermined categories at short time intervals. Observers had no knowledge of which children had been labeled exploratory or cautious. Results indicated primary differences in social interaction with peers, spontaneous expression of ideas and feelings and aspects of self-direction and autonomy in the classroom. However, exploratory and cautious groups were not systematically different in work persistence, management of classroom resources, the nature of contacts with teachers or the pattern of work relationships with peers. There was no simple confirmation of the hypothesis that exploratory children might be more generally effective in open classrooms than cautious children, though some patterns of behavior were different. Sex differences were discussed. (Author/SB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136956

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EXPLORATORY AND CAUTIOUS CHILDREN IN OPEN CLASSROOMS: AUTONOMY, LEARNING AND RELATIONSHIPS[1]

Patricia Minuchin
Temple University

In this paper, I will be reporting the findings of a study on exploratory and cautious children as they function in open classrooms. It is well understood, by now, that open classrooms provide a different context for children's learning and development than more traditional settings. There has been little documentation of child behavior in open settings, however, and little study of the possible relationship between children's response styles and their sustained behavior in such environments. The research project I will be describing had two objectives: to investigate differences in functioning between exploratory and cautious children in open classrooms, and to document general aspects of child behavior in such settings. I will be reporting primarily on the first aspect.

For purposes of the research, 60 children were selected for study. Thirty were designated as curious and exploratory children, on the basis of assessment procedures to be described, and 30 as cautious and reserved. These 60 children were then observed throughout the school year in their first grade open classrooms.

The study was focused on four areas of functioning: curiosity and exploration in the classroom, learning and mastery, autonomous behavior, and interpersonal contacts. There were a number of predictions in these areas. In open classroom environments, much is left to the

PS 009209

---

[1]Paper presented at the meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, New Orleans, 1977. The research reported in this paper was supported by the National Institute of Education (#NE-G-00-3-0018).

initiative of the child--to select material, to direct his or her own activities, to make contact and seek help when needed, and so on. In such a setting, it seemed theoretically possible that exploratory children would function differently and perhaps more effectively than cautious children. It was predicted that they might engage in a wider range of activities, explore materials more actively, and raise more questions than cautious children; that they might be more self-directed and autonomous in their behavior; and that they might engage in more interaction with other people, initiating contact more frequently with teachers and peers. These predictions were tested, and other aspects of behavior were analyzed, though in some areas there were no specific expectations.

Description of the Study

The research was located in six open classrooms in a large city. The classrooms were selected on the basis of certain characteristics generally associated with open education: the availability of a variety of materials, some flexibility in the use of space and time, the opportunity for children to choose activities, move about freely and interact with other people, and a concept of teaching that focused on the guidance of learning rather than the direct transmission of knowledge. The six classrooms ranged from a middle class private school setting to inner city classrooms associated with the open education (EDC) Follow-Through model.

Children were selected for study on the basis of teacher ratings and an individual assessment session. The concept of curiosity that guided the selection was based on the theoretical and research literature. It stressed the tendency of the child to raise questions, explore objects, and approach new experience with anticipation and interest.

Each teacher rated the children in her class by sorting them into 5 groups, from the most cautious to the most exploratory, using a guiding definition. Each child in the class was also seen in an individual session that involved two exploratory tasks. One was an Object-Exploration task, in which the child explored some novel objects for a period of 3 minutes, and the other was a Perceptual-Verbal task developed specifically for the project. In this task, the child explored a large picture, or "discovery board"--a park scene showing many people in a variety of activities--and was asked to tell about it. Responses on these two tasks yielded scores for Object-Exploration and for Perceptual-Verbal Exploration, based on involvement, the amount and variety of response, and so forth.

In all, 134 children were tested. There were no sex differences on any of these measures, and the three measures suggested moderate consistency in exploratory behavior, showing low but significant intercorrelations. Teacher ratings were most highly correlated with the verbal expression of curiosity on the "discovery board" ($r = 37$; $p < .01$).

Ten children were selected for study in each classroom: 5 exploratory and 5 cautious. They were selected primarily on the basis of the consistency and nature of their scores on the 3 assessment techniques. They were also matched for age as closely as possible within each classroom, and all had had preschool experience before entering first grade. As Table 1 indicates, the mean scores of exploratory and cautious children selected for study were significantly different on all 3 assessment measures. In this selected sample, the intercorrelations among the three measures were high ($r^s = .57$, .60 and .67; all $p < .01$).

The final sample consists of 30 girls and 30 boys, but there are more exploratory boys than girls (18:12) and more cautious girls than boys (18:12). As I've already indicated, there were no sex differences in the total tested population on any measure. In choosing subjects, however, the primary criterion was consistency of exploratory or cautious behavior and there was no effort to balance the groups for sex. In a sense, the composition of the selected groups was the study's first 'finding'. According to the data compiled for selecting subjects, the average incidence of exploratory behavior in the two sexes is not systematically different, but consistently exploratory behavior is found more often in boys, while consistently cautious behavior is found more often in girls.

Observational classroom data were collected on the study children in two forms: through detailed narrative records, focused continuously on the behavior of one child at a time for 5 to 15 minute periods, and through a precoded observation system, in which behavior was coded in predetermined categories at short time intervals. The system was developed for the specific purposes of the project. All observers gathered data on all children, rotating through the classrooms according to a schedule. Observers had no knowledge of which children had been designated as "exploratory" or "cautious".

Precode data were tallied, and narrative records were masked and then analyzed according to systematic schemes of analysis developed for the project. Analysis was focused on the areas of research interest: curiosity, autonomy, mastery and learning, and interpersonal contacts. Interrater reliability for rating schemes ranged from 71 to 86% agreement.

The data to be reported in this paper are based on 6 narrative records and 8 precode records on each child, gathered during free activity periods over a span of several months. The total observation time per child was 110 minutes, 70 minutes recorded in narrative form and 40 minutes through the precode system.

The data have been analyzed through a 2x2 Analysis of Variance for curiosity style and sex.

Results

The primary differences between exploratory and cautious children appeared in three areas: social interaction with peers, the spontaneous expression of ideas and feelings, and aspects of self-direction and autonomy in the classroom. Some of these had not been predicted.

The interpersonal data (Table 5) indicated that exploratory children initiated more social contact with other children, maintained more sociable interchange, and expressed more socially oriented curiosity, particularly in comparison with cautious girls. All children spent most of their time with children of their own sex, but exploratory children were more likely than cautious children to work and socialize with children of the opposite sex. There was also some suggestion that exploratory boys, in particular, expressed more anger or aggression than other children though aggressive behavior was rare, in these classrooms, and was mostly verbal rather than physical or explosive.

The mastery data indicate (Table 3) that exploratory children expressed their work-oriented ideas more than cautious children and talked more about their experiences. They also expressed more positive feelings of pleasure in their own mastery and in learning. The autonomy data (Table 4) suggested some overall difference in the self-direction of exploratory and cautious children. Exploratory children were more

apt to explore and elaborate activities on their own initiative. In general, then, the findings suggest that exploratory and cautious children differed in expressive behavior, in social exploration, and in some forms of initiative in the classroom.

The two groups did not differ in other aspects of functioning, however. Differences between exploratory and cautious children were not so extensive as might be expected. Some predictions were not confirmed and others only partially so. There was little evidence, for instance, that curiousity and exploratory behavior are consistently expressed through time in the open classroom environment. Despite the clear differences in tested response style that led to the selection of the two groups, exploratory children did not consistently approach new experiences, explore objects or raise questions in the classroom more than cautious children did (Table 2). To the extent that there were significant differences between the two groups, they were in the expected direction: exploratory children tended to express more social curiosity, though they did not raise more work-oriented questions, and cautious girls were less apt to explore objects than other children. The pattern of exploratory behavior in the two groups, however, was not as different as might be expected from the original assessment of the children.

To consider the other specific predictions: It had been predicted that exploratory children might involve themselves in a wider range of activities than cautious children. This prediction was not confirmed. Children of all groups engaged in a range of activities, and exploratory children did not make broader use of the activities and materials in the classroom than cautious children did (Table 3).

The prediction concerning autonomous behavior was partially confirmed. Exploratory children were more likely to extend and elaborate their own activities. However, they were not more persistent, did not select materials or use resources more autonomously than cautious children, and were not more self-directed in implementing the classroom routines (Table 4). In this area, there were indications of subgroup differences between cautious girls and cautious boys, which I will describe shortly.

The prediction concerning interpersonal contact was partially confirmed. There were differences in social interaction with peers but exploratory children did not initiate more contact with teachers and peers for work purposes (Table 5). Children in both groups had extensive work-oriented contact with peers and very similar patterns of interaction. Exploratory children helped and sought help from peers to about the same extent as cautious children. Contact with teachers was not frequent, compared to contact with peers, but it was similar for both groups and was primarily focused on learning and work issues. Teachers made similar contact with exploratory and cautious children for learning purposes, but in their rare contacts with children for social or control purposes, they contacted boys more than girls, and paid least attention to cautious girls.

In general, the pattern of interpersonal contacts showed the expected differences in <u>social</u> interaction but not in work-oriented contacts. It seems generally true, in fact, that the predictions which were not confirmed involved the children's relation to work and learning: the range of their activities, their work-oriented contacts, the exploration of objects, the expression of intellectual curiosity, and certain aspects of self-directed activity and responsible classroom work behavior.

This seems an important fact and will be discussed briefly at the conclusion of the paper.

Some of the findings of the study can best be understood by considering girls and boys separately within the cautious and exploratory groups. I will first summarize general sex differences, then describe the 4 subgroups:

Boys expressed their ideas more freely than girls and engaged in more interaction with other people. They were more likely to approach new experience than girls and were more persistent. Boys engaged in more fantasy and dramatic play than girls, and were much more involved in roughhouse and teasing, though there were no overall sex differences in aggressive expression. Girls were proportionately more involved in skill and symbol system activities than boys. There was some suggestion that they were more self-directed in selecting activities and that cautious g..ls, at least, implemented classroom routines more autonomously than other children. A number of these differences were carried by particular subgroups, however, and I will briefly summarize the characteristics of exploratory and cautious boys and girls.

Cautious girls were reticent in the classroom. They were least apt to make social contact with others or to explore relationships by interacting with children of the opposite sex. They were less expressive and lively than other children: they were least apt to share their ideas openly, to tease and joke around with other children, or to express positive feelings about their learning and their own accomplishments. They accounted for some of the clearest differences between groups in social and expressive areas. On the other hand, they seemed to maintain a responsible, self-directed attitude toward their work--selecting materials, persisting in their activities, following classroom routines

and so on. They were also in as much contact with teachers and peers to help, seek advice and discuss learning matters as other children were. They were not completely ineffective in the classroom and they were not isolated. The open context seems to draw children into contact with others. These reticent children were in interaction with their peers, even if not so much as others and even though they may have been more dependent on the initiative of other children to establish the contact.

Cautious boys presented a different pattern. . . in some ways the reverse of cautious girls. They were clearly sociable and lively in the classroom, spending less time by themselves than other children and engaging in more teasing and roughhouse. On the other hand, they were less autonomous and self-directed in their work activities than other children, including cautious girls.

Exploratory boys were lively and expressive. They were in active contact with their peers but relatively self-directed. They openly shared their ideas and feelings as they worked, and they played with vigor, both in fantasy activities and in sociable roughhouse with others. They seemed to express anger more than other children and were more apt to ignore or challenge teacher direction, though the absolute amount of aggression and resistance was minor. There was an underlying tone of initiative, energy and expressiveness in their behavior.

Exploratory girls are difficult to describe. They seemed to have the most active pattern of work exchange with teachers and they shared with exploratory boys certain characteristics of social initiative, expressiveness and autonomous behavior. They did not have such unique characteristics, however, as other groups. On the other hand, these girls did not share the somewhat sex-stereotyped and troubling reticence

of the cautious girls, and their style of expressiveness would probably not raise issues of control, as the behavior of exploratory boys might occasionally do. In its balance, the functioning of exploratory girls might be well adapted to the open classroom environment.

In briefly discussing the findings of the study and in concluding this paper, I would like to make three points:

1. There was no evidence, in the data, that exploratory children are clearly more effective in open classrooms than cautious children. If all the predictions had been confirmed, the evaluation would be different. If exploratory children were more autonomous in all respects; if they selected and engaged in a wider range of activities, explored materials more actively, and raised more questions; if they interacted more with teachers and peers for all purposes; their functioning would need to be regarded as more productive, and cautious children would seem to be missing the learning and developmental opportunities of these classrooms. There were some important differences in functioning, but they were not as extensive as one might theoretically predict, and in some respects they may simply have been differences in expressive and social style rather than more or less effective. As is often true, the implications of these differences for growth in the classroom might well depend on the alertness and sensitivity of teachers in arranging profitable experiences for different kinds of children, and in helping with difficulties. There is little suggestion, however, that cautious children are in developmental jeopardy, per se, in the open context.

2. The question of continuing consistency in response style is of general professional interest and is not simply answered in these

data. The stability of exploratory behavior is usually assessed under laboratory conditions across different stimulus situations or through retests. In this study, stability was examined through the relationship between laboratory assessment and continuing behavior in a natural context. In literal terms, defining curiosity through similar behavior in the two contexts, there was not much consistency. Exploratory children did not more consistently approach new experience, explore objects and express verbal curiosity in the classroom, as they had in the testing, though they differed from cautious children in some particulars of curiosity already described. If we are willing to broaden the definition, however, we see some differences that are consistent with the tested differences in response style, though some funny transformations may happen on the way to the open classroom. Exploratory children, for instance, were not more involved in object exploration but they did extend and explore their activities more autonomously. Perhaps this represents an exploratory attitude toward activities that subsumes but transcends the exploration of objects per se. In the same way, the tendency of exploratory children to mix more with children of the opposite sex, express more social curiosity, and initiate more social contact may represent a kind of 'social exploration' on the developmental frontier of peer relations. With this broader definition, there was some evidence of consistency between the original designation of exploratory and cautious response styles and spontaneous behavior in the classroom. It is clear from the data, however, that we cannot necessarily expect the same kind of consistency in the expression of curiosity from boys and girls in the natural context of an open setting.

3. The profile of findings, in which differences were not found in work-related areas, is interesting, and invites the appropriation of some ecological concepts to explain the results. Such concepts stress the organizing power of the setting, which tends to call out and reinforce certain behavior from the people in those settings. Presumably the organizing effects would be most potent in relation to the focal aspects of the environment. In these open classrooms, teacher attitudes and classroom structure encouraged children to select and explore activities, express curiosity, direct their activities responsibly and work together. Educators defined the educational task and philosophy primarily in these terms. Social interaction and the open expression of ideas and feelings may have been valued and acceptable, but they were not so central to the environmental purpose. Perhaps for this reason, the underlying tendencies of the children accounted for more of their social and expressive behavior and produced differences in functioning. The classroom ecology, however, may have moved most children in certain directions, with regard to learning procedures and work attitudes, and may have reduced stylistic differences among the children in these areas. To understand the patterns of functioning in the open classroom, we may need to consider the power of the environment, the nature of the individual, and the interaction between these forces.

Tables to accompany

Exploratory and Cautious Children in Open Classrooms: Autonomy, Learning and Relationships

Patricia Minuchin
Temple University

Meetings of the Society for Research
in Child Development
New Orleans, 1977

Table 1

Mean Scores of Exploratory and Cautious Study Children
on Teacher Ratings and Tasks of Curiosity and Exploration

Assessment Technique	Exploratory			Cautious			Total Study Sample		
	Girls (N=12)	Boys (N=18)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=18)	Boys (N=12)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=30)	Boys (N=30)	Total (N=60)
Teacher Ratings *									
Mean	4.8	4.7	4.7	2.1	1.4	1.8	3.2	3.4	3.3
SD	(.45)	(.49)		(.90)	(.52)				
Object-Exploration *									
Mean	13.6	11.4	12.3	6.1	5.6	5.9	9.1	9.1	9.1
SD	(3.63)	(2.68)		(4.80)	(3.85)				
Perceptual-Verbal Exploration: "Discovery Board" *									
Mean	45.4	46.1	45.8	22.2	20.2	21.4	31.5	35.7	33.6
SD	(9.83)	(8.45)		(18.50)	(14.50)				

* High figure indicates most exploratory

Table 2

Curiosity and Exploratory Behavior in the Classroom:
Mean Scores by Exploratory Style and Sex

Variable	Observational Source	Form of Scoring	Exploratory			Cautious			Total Study Sample		
			Girls (N=12)	Boys (N=18)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=18)	Boys (N=12)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=30)	Boys (N=30)	Total (N=60)
Approach to New Experience	Narr.	tally+	.2	.6	.4	.4	.6	.5	.3	.6	.5
	Precode	tally	5.5	5.9	5.8	6.4	5.9	6.2	6.0	5.9	6.0
Object-Exploration	Narr.	tally+	2.3	1.7	1.9	1.2	1.8	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.7
	Precode	tally+	.3	.3	.3	.2	.4	.3	.3	.4	.3
Verbal Curiosity											
Intellectual, work-oriented questioning	Narr.	tally	2.4	2.9	2.7	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.1	3.1
	Precode	tally	4.3	3.9	4.0	2.9	3.3	3.1	3.5	3.7	3.6
	Narr. + Pre.	combined tally	6.7	6.8	6.7	6.6	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.8	6.7
Social questioning	Narr.	tally	3.5	3.0	3.2	1.9	2.9	2.3	2.5	3.0	2.8
Total questioning (Int. + Soc.)	Narr.	combined tally	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.6	6.4	5.9	5.7	6.1	5.9

+ These two measures were converted to a 2 point scale (absence or presence) for analysis because of the high incidence of zero scores and the nature of the distributions.

Table 3

Mastery and Learning: Mean Scores by Exploratory Style and Sex

Variable	Observational Source	Form of Scoring	Exploratory Girls (N=12)	Exploratory Boys (N=18)	Exploratory Total (N=30)	Cautious Girls (N=18)	Cautious Boys (N=12)	Cautious Total (N=30)	Total Study Sample Girls (N=30)	Total Study Sample Boys (N=30)	Total Study Sample Total (N=60)
Range and Content of Activities											
Range of Activities	Narr.	Tally	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.8	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.2
	Precode	Tally	4.2	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Skill Activities	Narr.	Rating*	4.7	4.4	4.5	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.3	4.2
	Precode	Tally	15.8	12.9	14.1	17.2	12.2	15.2	16.7	12.6	14.7
Fantasy and dramatic play	Narr.	Rating*	1.0	2.9	2.2	1.2	1.7	1.4	1.1	2.4	1.8
	Precode	Tally	3.3	5.8	4.8	4.8	7.8	6.0	4.2	6.6	5.4
Expression of Thinking Processes											
Simple, work-oriented ideas	Narr.	Tally	21.0	26.6	24.3	19.7	19.1	19.5	20.2	23.6	21.9
	Precode	Tally	16.8	19.6	18.4	15.0	19.0	16.6	15.7	19.3	17.5
	Narr.+Pre.	Combined Tally	37.8	46.2	42.7	34.7	38.1	36.1	35.9	42.9	39.4
Recall and Communication of experience	Narr.	Rating+	.7	.6	.6	.3	.3	.3	.5	.5	.5
	Precode	Tally+	.8	.6	.6	.5	.5	.5	.6	.5	.6
Complex thinking processes	Narr.	Rating*	2.5	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.0	2.3	2.5	2.1	2.3
	Precode	Tally	2.2	3.7	3.1	2.3	2.8	2.5	2.3	3.3	2.8
Expression of Feeling about Mastery and Learning											
Positive feeling	Narr.	Tally	3.5	3.6	3.6	2.4	2.8	2.5	2.8	3.3	3.1
	Precode	Tally	.7	1.1	.9	.8	.7	.7	.7	.9	.8
	Narr.+Pre.	Combined Tally	4.7	4.8	4.8	3.2	3.6	3.3	3.8	4.3	4.1
Negative feeling	Narr.	Tally+	.3	.4	.4	.4	.3	.4	.4	.4	.4

*For these variables, each narratiye record was rated on a scale from 0-2 (non-existent, minor or major factor in the record); the child's ratings were then tallied across observations.

+These three measures were converted to a 2 point scale (absence or presence) for analysis because of the high incidence of zero scores and the nature of the distributions.

Table 4

Autonomy and Self-Direction:
Mean Scores by Exploratory Style and Sex

Variable	Observational Source	Form of Scoring	Exploratory			Cautious			Total Study Sample		
			Girls (N=12)	Boys (N=18)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=18)	Boys (N=12)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=30)	Boys (N=30)	Total (N=60)
Autonomy and Self-Direction (overall)	Narr.	Rating*	10.2*	9.7	9.9	10.7	11.1	10.8	10.5	10.3	10.4
Autonomous selection of activities and materials	Narr.	Rating*	14.7*	15.4	15.1	15.1	16.6	15.7	14.9	15.9	15.4
	Precode	Tally+	1.1+	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3
Persistence and involvement	Narr.	Rating*	11.1*	10.4	10.7	10.2	11.3	10.6	10.6	10.7	10.6
	Precode	Tally+	1.9+	3.0	2.6	1.7	2.6	2.1	1.8	2.8	2.3
Self-directed elaboration and exploration of activities	Narr.	Rating*	13.0*	12.1	12.5	13.7	14.0	13.8	13.4	12.9	13.2
Self-directed use of human and material resources to facilitate work	Narr.	Rating*	13.7*	14.4	14.1	14.2	14.5	14.3	14.0	14.5	14.2
	Precode	Tally+	2.9+	2.5	2.7	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.4
Autonomous implementation of classroom procedures	Narr.	Rating*	15.6*	15.8	15.7	14.6	15.8	15.0	15.0	15.8	15.4

* Each narrative record was rated on a scale from 1-3 (1 = most autonomous) and the child's ratings were tallied across observations. Low scores on these narrative ratings indicate the most autonomy.

+ Precode tallies were cumulative. High scores on precode tallies indicate the most autonomy.

Table 5

Interpersonal Contacts:
Mean Scores by Exploratory Style and Sex

Variable	Observational Source	Form of Scoring	Exploratory			Cautious			Total Study Sample		
			Girls (N=12)	Boys (N=18)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=18)	Boys (N=12)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=30)	Boys (N=30)	Total (N=60)
Amount and Distribution of Contact with People											
Total interaction with adults and children	Narr.	Tally	47.2	51.0	49.5	42.1	49.0	44.9	44.1	50.2	47.2
	Precode	Tally	34.0	35.8	35.1	34.1	37.8	36.3	34.1	36.6	35.3
Proportion of contacts with children	Narr.	Tally (% total contacts)	.79	.81	.80	.78	.75	.76	.78	.78	.78
	Precode	Tally (% total contacts)	.77	.86	.82	.83	.85	.84	.81	.86	.83
Time spent alone	Precode	Tally	14.9	15.3	15.1	13.5	8.6	11.5	14.0	12.6	13.3
Contacts with Adults											
Child-initiated contacts (total)	Narr.	Tally	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.2	7.0	5.9	5.4	6.3	5.8
Learning and work-oriented contacts	Narr.	Tally (child-init.)	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.0	5.0	4.4	4.1	4.8	4.5
	Precode	Tally (all contact)	4.0	2.0	2.8	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.8	2.0	2.4
Social contacts	Narr.	Tally+ (child-init.)	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.1
Adult-initiated contacts with children	Narr.	Tally	3.3	3.5	3.4	2.7	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.3	3.2
	Precode	Tally	3.0	1.7	2.2	3.0	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.2	2.6
Proportion of positive responses to adult contact	Narr.	Tally (% total resp to adults)	.58	.28	.40	.50	.42	.47	.53	.34	.43

+ Measure converted to a 3 point scale (0-1-2+) for analysis because of the nature of the distribution.

Table 5 (continued)

Interpersonal Contacts:
Mean Scores by Exploratory Style and Sex

Variable	Observational Source	Form of Scoring	Exploratory			Cautious			Total Study Sample		
			Girls (N=12)	Boys (N=18)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=18)	Boys (N=12)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=30)	Boys (N=30)	Total (N=60)
Amount and Distribution of Contact with Peers											
Child-initiated contacts with peers (total)	Narr.	Tally	23.6	24.0	23.8	19.8	21.3	20.4	21.3	22.9	22.1
Proportion of contacts with same-sex peers	Narr.	Tally (% total child cont.)	.69	.69	.69	.79	.73	.77	.75	.71	.73
Initiated contacts for work purposes (total)	Narr.	Tally	18.3	21.9	20.5	19.1	20.0	19.5	18.8	21.1	20.0
Initiated contacts for social purposes (total)	Narr.	Tally	22.2	22.2	22.2	16.3	21.2	18.3	18.7	21.8	20.3
Nature of Work Contacts with Peers											
Helpful to others	Narr.	Tally (child-init)	5.6	5.0	5.2	4.9	4.5	4.7	5.2	4.8	5.0
	Precode	Tally (all contact)	3.5	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.7
Use of peers as learning and work resources	Narr.	Tally (child-init)	3.0	2.3	2.6	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.5	2.7
	Precode	Tally (all contact)	2.0	2.1	2.1	1.5	2.2	1.8	1.7	2.1	1.9

Table 5 (continued)

Interpersonal Contacts:
Mean Scores by Exploratory Styles and Sex

Variable	Observational Source	Form of Scoring	Exploratory			Cautious			Total Study Sample		
			Girls (N=12)	Boys (N=18)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=18)	Boys (N=12)	Total (N=30)	Girls (N=30)	Boys (N=30)	Total (N=60)
Nature of Social Contacts with Peers											
Sociable interchange	Narr.	Tally (child-init)	12.4	12.6	12.5	8.9	10.5	9.5	10.3	11.8	11.0
	Precode	Tally (all contact)	12.4	13.3	12.9	13.0	15.3	13.9	12.7	14.1	13.4
Aggressive-assertive interaction (verbal and physical)	Narr.	Tally+	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.4
	Precode	Tally++	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1
	Narr. & Precode	Tally (combined raw scores)	2.8	4.4	3.8	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.8	3.4
Social distancing	Narr.	Tally	2.0	2.3	2.2	1.8	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.2	2.1

27

+ Measure converted to 4 points ($0\text{-}1\text{-}2\text{-}3^{+}$) because of the nature of the distribution

++ Measure converted to 3 points ($0\text{-}1\text{-}2^{+}$) because of the nature of the distribution

28